OFFICIAL RESOLUTION ON ESTATE DUTY ACT.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg leave of the House to move the Official Resolution which is as follows:

"Whereas by resolutions passed in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution, the levy of estate duty in respect of agricultural land in the State of Mysore is governed by the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) passed by Parliament;

And whereas the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) has been amended by Act 17 of 1954, Act 41 of 1954, Act 36 of 1957 and Act 33 of 1958 passed by Parliament;

And whereas it appears to this Assembly to be desirable that the matters specified in the amending Acts aforesaid in so far as they relate to estate duty in respect of agricultural land should be regulated in the State by Parliament by law;

Now, therefore, this Assembly hereby resolves in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution that the matters aforesaid in so far as they are matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the State may be regulated in the State by Parliament by law and for this purpose the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) may be amended accordingly."

2-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"Whereas by resolutions passed in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution, the levy of estate duty in respect of agricultural land in the State of Mysore is governed by the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) passed by Parliament;

And whereas the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) has been amended by Act 17 of 1954, Act 41 of 1954, Act 36 of 1957 and Act 33 of 1958 passed by Parliament;

And whereas it appears to this Assembly to be desirable that the matters specified in the amending Acts aforesaid in so far as they relate to estate duty in respect of agricultural land should be regulated in the State by Parliament by law;

Now, therefore, this Assembly hereby resolves in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution that the matters aforesaid in so far as they are matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the State may be regulated in the State by Parliament by law and for this purpose the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) may be amended accordingly."

Sri U. M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—I rise to a point of order. Copies of the Estates Duty Act have not been supplied to the members. Therefore we are unable to discuss this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Only those Acts which have been passed by this State are supplied. So far as this Act is concerned, it is passed by the Parliament. Copies of the Act are kept in the library and the members may go and refer to them.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—All the members cannot go and sit there. There will be a struggle, as there are only a limited number of copies.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To supply copies of such Acts is not in vogue.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—It is the duty of the Government to supply copies to all the members. Otherwise, it will be difficult to take part in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not the duty of the Government to supply copies.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Then, should we simply sit and accept the resolution brought in?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members can go to the library and there refer to that Act. The Government is not in duty bound to supply copies. Half a dozen copies are kept in the library. If the Government can supply individually to members they can very well do so. But there is no duty cast on them.

*Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—The motion that is sought to be passed in this House is in the nature of a Bill contemplated under articles 249 and 250 of the Constitution. These are the subjects which are included in the State List. Therefore, when they are in the State List and when the Central Government feels the necessity of passing a Bill of this nature, then they will have to bring a motion of this nature in the States in the proper form. They have not brought it in the form of a Bill and therefore the motion is not proper and not according to procedure.

*Sri T. MARIAPPA.—With your leave I desire to explain the scope of the official resolution. The House is aware that the power to legislate in respect of Estates Duty on agricultural lands is vested in the State Legislatures by virtue of Entry 48, List 2 of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. It is, therefore, necessary that the consent of the State Legislature should be obtained for any law which relates to agricultural land. Article 252 of the Constitution is as follows :

> "(1) If it appears to the Legislatures of two or more States to be desirable that any of the matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the States except as provided in articles 249 and 250 should be regulated in such States by Parliament by law, and if resolutions to that effect are passed by all the Houses of the Legislatures of those States, it shall be lawful for Parliament to pass an Act for regulating that matter accordingly, and any Act so passed shall apply to such States and to any other State by which it is adopted afterwards by resolution passed in that behalf by the House or, where there are two Houses, by each of the Houses of the Legislature of that State.
>
> (2) Any Act so passed by Parliament may be amended or repealed by an Act of Parliament passed or adopted in like manner, but shall not, as respects any State to which it applies, be amended or repealed by an Act of the Legislature of that State."

Therefore, it is very clear. Either the original Act or the amending Acts can only come into force in a State with the consent of the Legislatures of those States. Therefore there is no dispute about it. In fact, if my Hon'ble friend recalls to his memory the proceedings of the Legislature of the old Mysore State, he would see that in the sessions of the Legislative Assembly and Council held in October 1955, we adopted the Estates Duty Act of 1953. Therefore Act 34 of 1953 became applicable to the old Mysore State. Similarly it was adopted by the Bombay and Hyderabad States. In the re-organised State of Mysore, the Estates Duty Act, *i.e.* Act 34 of 1953 is in full force. Subsequently, Act 17 of 1954, Act 19 of 1954, 41 of 1954 and Act 36 of 1957 came into force—these were all amending Acts.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—The Hon'ble Minister stated that Bombay and Hyderabad States adopted the resolution. What about Madras ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Madras also adopted it.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—By way of resolution ?

*Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Yes, by means of an appropriate resolution. Therefore, these amending Acts cannot come into force if the new State of Mysore does not adopt them. But those amending Acts are about minor amendments. But the amending Act 33 of 1958 was a major amendment to Act 34 of 1953. That is the reason why this resolution has been placed before this House and if the House were to accord consent to this resolution, then only all the amending Acts would be made applicable to this State. If only my friend had had patience, I would have explained. After all the first three amending Acts are of a minor character. It is only the amending Act 33 of 1958 which I am going to explain, which leaves nobody in doubt and which will not necessitate any heavy reference to the Central Act. Moreover, the Central amending Acts have all been published

in the Gazette and all the Gazette copies have been supplied to M.L.As. and M.L.Cs. I have also a copy of the Act. Therefore, I wish to say that for these reasons the Acts are not made available to Hon'ble Members. To say that the whole thing is new does not hold good. With your permission, I will continue my arguments and make the whole matter clear. Therefore it is for the purpose of obtaining the consent of the House that this R solution is placed before the House. Let me explain the scope of the amending Acts.

The Estates Duty Act was adopted in October 1955 and it is in force in the new Mysore State. It is in force not only in Mysore, but in Bombay and Hyderabad Karnatak and in Madras and Coorg areas also. These are the amendments amending the original Act. The Estates Duty Act was introduced and the first amending Act 17 of 1954 was brought in by way of clarification and we ma e minor changes in clauses (*f*) and (*g*). Amending Act 41 of 1954 extended the principle of the Act. Amending Act 36 of 1957 was m rely for correcting a printing error. So far as these three amending Acts are concerned, let us not worry ourselves or unnecessarily exercise ourselves. Therefore, the real Act with which we have to deal is Act 33 of 1958. Experience in the working of the Act for the last four years has been made use of to tighten up certain sections or certain provisions in the Act.

Therefore, the amending Bill was accordingly introduced in Parliament in February 1958. As the Hon'ble Members are aware, if consent of the state had been obtained prior to this, there would have been no necessity for a resolution of this kind. The main objects with which this amending bill is introduced are:

1. Reducing the present exemption limit in the case of property other than property governed by Mitakshara, Marumakathayam and Aliyasanthanam Laws from one lakh to Rs. 50,000.

2. Change of rate of duty in the case of property governed by Mitakshara, Marumakathayam and Aliyasanthanam laws.

3. Reducing the probate duty by 50 per cent. Their view is that it is too much to allow 100 per cent. Therefore, only 50 per cent is allowed.

4. Making certain changes in the assessment and appellate procedure so as to bring them in line with the direct Taxation Acts.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Copies may be supplied today and this may be taken up, tomorrow Sir.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I will make myself clear, Sir. I am dealing with the latest amendment, 1958. The duty limit in respect of value of the estate has been reduced from one lakh to 50,000, even in respect of properties governed under the Mitakshara, Marumakathayam and Aliyasanthanam Laws.

Secondly, the distinction between the general family property and other properties has been removed.

Thirdly, as regards reduction of rate of duty in respect of three slabs in the initial stages,

I will read it now:

	Existing rate	*Revised rate*
The first slab of Rs 50,000.	nil	nil
Next Rs. 50,000	nil	4 per cent
next Rs 50,000	7½ P.C.	6 ,,
next Rs 50,000	10 p.c.	10 ,,
next Rs. 1,00,000	12½ ,,	12 ,,
next 2,00,000	15	15
next 10,00,000	25	25
next 10,00,000	30	30
next 10,00,000	35	35

Therefore, only in three cases, has there been some change with regard to the rate of duty. The second slab of 50,000, was originally exempted because the exemption limit was 1,00,000. Now they have proposed 4 per cent. For the next slab of 50,000 it was 7½ per cent; they have now reduced it to 6 per cent.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—On a point of order, Sir. ಬಿಲ್ ಮೂವ್ ಆಗುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ objectionಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯವೆಂದು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದರೂ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಿಲ್ ಕನ್ಸಿಡರೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, copies of the Bill should be supplied before we proceed further, Sir. It is the right of the members

(SRI U. M. MADAPPA)

that copies should be supplied seven days before the consideration. This subject is being irregularly d scussed now, Sir. We want a ruling f om the Chair on this point.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.— I will explain and leave the decisi n to y u, Sir.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA Nanjangud).—I want the Hon'ble Minister to clarify whether action is being taken under Article 252 of the Constitution and if so, whether the procedure prescribed therein has been adopted in this case. That is the question we are asking. We have no objection to the Hon'ble Minister explaining it. But Arti le 252 prescribes a procedure. I want to know if the pr cedure prescribed here is adopted and whether what the Mon'ble Minister is bringing before the House is a resolution in the nature of a Bill and if so, whether the procedure prescribed by our Rules of Procedure is followed.

MR. SPEAKER.—Please read 252 :

"(1): If it appears to the Legislatures of two or more States to be desirable that any of the matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the States except as provided in articles 249 and 250 should be regulated in such States by Parliament by law, and if resolutions to that effect are passed by all the Houses of the Legislatures of those States, it shall be lawful for Parliament to pass an Act for regulating that matter accordingly, and any Act so passed shall apply to such States and to any other State by which it is adopted afterwards by a resolution passed in that behalf by the House or, where there are two Houses, by each of the Houses of the Legislature of that State."

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My point is, even before the latter portion of the article is given effect to, there must be an earlier resolution.

MR. SPEAKER.—There are certain conditions. The first condition is that if the Parliament wants to pass a law in respect of State matters, some of the States should consent and pass resolutions and inform the Parliament to pass the law in that respect.

The second condition is, after the Parliament passes the law, any other State by a res lution may adopt it, and we are now trying to do that. We are trying to adopt that law by a resolution.

SRI M C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—So far as Parliament is concerned, this amending Act of 1958 is in force and it will be in force until some time in 1959. Another Act will have to be passed by the Parliament to the effect that it may be law so far as this State is concerned. Under these circumstances, how do you say, that we should take it that the procedure that is now prescribed pertaining to what is passed by Parliament is already a law? If it is already a law, then it is another matter. But, whether it is already a law, is the question.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—I submitted to this House that this House adopted a resolution and in consequence of the adoption of that resolution the Estate Duty Act was in force in Mysore, Coorg, Bombay and Hyderabad—in all the units which form part of the present Mysore State. Therefore, the Estate Duty Ac —the principal Act is already in force. Now the Parliament effected 3 amendments; the latest amendment is the fourth one *i.e.*, 33 of 1958.

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The latest amendment covers agricultural property whereas the previous Act did nor refer to the subject matter which was included in the State List.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—It is not so. It also refers to the agricultural lands. Perhaps the Hon'ble member has not read the Act of 1954. I am going to give some figures under which we have got nearly Rs. 7 lakhs.

I was explaining that in the 5th slab the original duty was 12½ per cent ; it is reduced to 12 per cent. In all other respects we have kept the existing rates in the amending Bill.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Has not the Parliament enacted this? Is it the suggestion of the Minister that this amendment has been given effect to? When the Act is already there, what is the point?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have accepted the jurisdiction of the Parliament to legislate in respect of agricultural land.

Sri J. B MALLARADHYA.—May I know on what date that resolution was passed ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—On 14th October 1955 in the old Mysore Assembly and on 15th October in the old Mysore Legislative Council.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಯಾವಾಗ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟೆವೋ ಆಗ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು ಏನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆ ? Whether it materially affects or not, it is a different thing. Therefore, consent of this House before it is introduced in Parliament is very necessary.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—If we do not give our consent, the amendment is not applicable to us.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Perfectly right.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—If an amendment passed by the Parliament has to be accepted by this Assembly because it has been included in the State List, would it not take the nature of a Bill ? If it should be in the nature of a Bill, all formalities should be observed. Now, because the word ' resolution ' is used we cannot understand the various stages in which it should be passed. Therefore, if we can consider that this is in the nature of a Bill, then all formalities are not observed. It is very incumbent on the part of the Government to give us 7 days notice. That has not been done. That fundamental duty cast on the Government has not been followed. Therefore, we cannot pass it as it is.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—At the time when the original Act was enacted by the Parliament what was the necessity that every State must see that it was made applicable to it ? Now the Parliament has a ready enacted the amending Bill and it has become an Act. Even for that at least two States must have been moved in that matter before the Parliament could take up that. In this particular case, have our neighbouring States passed a resolution or made a request to pass the amending Bill ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If my friend only reads the newspapers....

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I am not depending upon the newspapers. I want something authentic.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Madras has already debated it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even clause (2) of article 252 reads thus :

> " Any Act so passed by Parliament may be amended or repealed by an Act of Parliament passed or adopted in like manner but shall not, as respects any State to which it applies, be amended or repealed by an Act of the Legislature of that State."

Is there an obligation cast on us to pass this resolution?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Please read 252 (1) :

> " If it appears to the Legislatures of two or more States to be desirable that any of the matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the States except as provided in articles 249 and 250 should be regulated in such States by Parliament by law, and if resolutions to that effect are passed by all the Houses of the Legislatures of those States, it shall be lawful for Parliament to pass an Act for regulating that matter accordingly, and any Act so passed shall apply to such States and to any other State by which it is adopted afterwards by resolution passed in that behalf by the House or, where there are two Houses, by each of the Houses of the Legislature of that State."

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City) —If I have understood the position, the Minister was pleased to say that this House gave consent in the year 1955 for the adoption of the Central Act or gave consent to the Parliament to enact in matters on which this Legislature has jurisdiction. The Constitution says that in matters where the State Legislature is competent to legislate and

(SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO)

wh re consent is given to that effect, that Act becomes applicable. The State Legislature gave permission to pass an Act as contained in the resolution and it was also adopted later. Any variation under the Central Act that is made needs the concurrence of State legislature because that variation that has not been approved by this Legislature. Therefore, the contention that the State Legislature is the legislature that should adopt the Bill passed by the Parliament or that the Legislature has no jurisdiction to pass this resolution has no basis. Since this House has given consent to the Centre to pass an Act in respect of which a State Legislature has jurisdiction, the State Legislature has and should give consent to effect any changes in the Act passed by the Parliament. Therefore, we would be well within our rights to pass this resolution and without passing it the Central Amending Act will not become applicable to us.

3 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under article 252 (1) of the Constitution it is clear that the Parliament has got the power to legislate on State subjects if the States give the power to the Parliament to legislate. If the Parliament has already legislated on a particular matter and if it wants to amend or repeal that legislation, the question is whether the power to do so also lies with the Parliament. Clause (2) of that article makes the position in this respect very clear. If an Act has already been passed by the Parliament, that Act can be amended or repealed by an Act of Parliament. For that, no resolution of this House is necessary. But for adopting that, a resolution of this House is necessary. This legislature has no power to amend or repeal such an Act. It can only adopt. When the Parliament has amended the Estate Duty Act, the only thing that remains is that, if this House wants to adopt it, it may pass a resolution to that effect. If it does not want to adopt it, it need not pass a resolution. If it is the intention of any Hon'ble Member to improve upon it, I have no objection to it; nor will the Government have any objection to it.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—What is the procedure to be adopted ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have to pass a resolution.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—We have to adopt the procedure followed in the case of a Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A resolution cannot be a Bill.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is the view of this House that they are going to adopt the amending Act.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—In case we do not adopt this resolution, shall we take it for granted that it will not be in force in our State ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Certainly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for lunch and meet again after half an hour.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Ten Minutes past Three of the Clock and met again at Forty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we start with business I would like to announce the Bills that will be taken up tomorrow. They are (1) the Mysore Entertainment Tax Bill, 1958 and (2) the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Bill, 1958. Both these Bills will be taken up tomorrow. Monday and Tuesday are reserved for considering the Gorwala report.

Official Resolution on Estate Duty Act

(*Continued*)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In what particular issue of the *Mysore Gazette* the amending Act of 1958 has been published?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The date of the Gazette is Thursday, 15th May 1958.

Sri C. K RAJAIAH SETTY (Chiknaikanhalli) —There is a further amendment in the Lok Sabha.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—To the best extent possible I have made myself clear. I once again say that the Estate Duty Act of 53 is already in force and duty it is levied on the agricultural lands. I want to give another information: so far as old Mysore State was concerned, the levy was extended as per Notification dated 9th December 1955 issued by the Government of India adding the name of Mysore to I Schedule of the Estate Duty Act. The entire proceeds from the levy of Estate Duty on agricultural lands are credited to the State. The aggregate estate of the deceased including agricultural lands is first of all assessed to estate duty at the rates prescribed in the II Schedule of the Act. The tax is then apportioned between agricultural lands and property other than agricultural lands in proportion to the value of each item in the aggregate estate. The main points on which the Act has been amended by the amending Act of 58 have already been mentioned by me.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Since the Hon'ble Minister said that the entire proceeds of the State from the levy of Estate Duty on agricultural lands would be allocated to the State's finances, what would happen to the subsequent enactment of 58 passed by the Parliament where they have fixed the rate in relation to the distribution of both excise duty and estate duty on the recommendation of the Finance Commission?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Unless we accept the amendment we will not be in a position to share all the proceeds of the estate duty. Nevertheless the old Act will be in force. According to the old Act—the total number of estate duty cases completed between 15th October 1953 and 31st October 1958 involving valuation of agricultural lands in Mysore State is 67; the approximate value of the agricultural lands in Mysore State valued in the above cases is Rs. 75 lakhs; the estate duty attributable to the agricultural lands situated in Mysore State levied in the above cases is Rs. 9,05,879; the amount of duty collected so far out of the above is Rs. 7,92,699. They have not collected all the information as yet. I assure this House that in the new dispensation we are likely to get more because the maximum is lower and in the second slab there is higher taxation.

There is another point. One of my friends interrupted me saying that a Bill should have been brought. I respectfully submit he is entirely wrong because it is the Parliament that has to enact a legislation in this behalf. The State Legislature can only adopt it by means of a resolution. Therefore it can never be in the form of a Bill. As provided in article 252(2) of the Constitution, the State Legislature is not competent either to amend or even to repeal. The power to amend or repeal is vested in the Parliament.

With these few words I commend the resolution for the acceptance of this House because it is in our own interest, it adds a little more to our treasury and it brings down disparity between large landed society and small holders. From all points of view it is very desirable that this House should give its consent to this resolution.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿವರ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅರ್ಥ ಕೇವಲ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟೇ ಅಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು? In other words ನಮಗೆ ಏನೂ ಪವರ್ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ, ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಅಂದಹಾಗಾಯಿತು. ನಮಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪವರ್ ಇಲ್ಲದಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಶಕ್ತಿ, ಹಕ್ಕು ಇಲ್ಲವೋ, ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್ ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಭಾವನೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ತಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಘನತೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ನೀವು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳದೆ ಮುಚ್ಚಿದರೂ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಹಣ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಣ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನೀವು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತೀವೆ ಎಂದು ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿರಿ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ಲ್ಯಾಬ್ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅರ್ಥ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ಉಪಸಚಿವರು, ಇಲ್ಲ, ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸ್ಲಾಬನ್ನು ಇಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಧಾನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದರಲ್ಲೂ ನಿಧಾನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಿಂದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನೀವು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಇದರಿಂದ ನೀವೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಿ. ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದ ರೇಟಿಗೂ, ಈಗಿನ ರೇಟಿಗೂ ಸ್ಲೋ ಎವುದಾದರೂ 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿನವರೆಗೆ ಏನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೋ, ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಐಶ್ವರ್ಯವಂತರಿಂದ, ಭಾರೀ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತ ರೈತರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ವರಮಾನ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ ಜತ್ತಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ, ನಾವೇನೋ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಆಗುವುದು ಇದ್ದರೆ, 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿನವರೆಗೆ ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿ ಇರುವ ಜನಗಳು ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಾಪರ್ಟಿ ಇರುವ ರೈತನು ಒಬ್ಬನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತಾನೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ದೇಸಾಯಿ (ಗಂಗಾವತಿ).—ಉಳಿದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ನನ್ನ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ವಿಷಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಬಡವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನಂಥ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಲಾರ್ಡ್ ನಿತಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡಲು ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಜನವಿರುವ ಸಂಸಾರವನ್ನು ತೂಗಿಸಲು, ಹತ್ತು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಹತ್ತು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಗೇಣಿದಾರ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಅವನ ಮಕ್ಕಳುಮರಿ ಉಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಕಡೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ! ಸಾಧಾರಣ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಇದು ಅಫೆಕ್ಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದರೆ, ಐಶ್ವರ್ಯವಂತರಿಗೆ, ಭಾರೀ ಜಮೀನುದಾರರಿಗೆ, ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಲಾಭ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸ್ಲ್ಯಾಬ್ ಒಳಗೆ ಇರುವವರು ಕಡಮೆ ಜನ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ವರಮಾನ ಖೋತಾ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಲಾಭದಾಯಕ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವಲ್ಲ

4 P.M.

ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಟ್ರೆಜರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದು ಟ್ರೆಜರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದಿರೆಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲ, ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಆಳತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷ, ಆ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ಬಂಡವಾಳಗಾರರೇ, ಅಥವ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟರೇ ಅಥವ ಬಡವರೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಬರೀ ಐಶ್ವರ್ಯವಂತರು ಲೋಕಸಭೆಗೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜರುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಜನ ರಾಜರುಗಳು ಕೂಡ ಈ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರಾಜರುಗಳ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವೂ ಇದೆ. ರಾಜರುಗಳು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಜನರ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇವರು ರಾಜತ್ವವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೂ ಇಂದಿರಾಗಾಂಧಿಯಿಂದ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥವರೆಲ್ಲ ಜನರ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿ, ಅವರು ಕೊಡುವಂಥ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು, ಅದು ಬಹುಮತದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಬಡತನವನ್ನು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಿದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಯೇ ಎಷ್ಟು ಪಾಲುಗಳಾದುವು, ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್‌ಗಳಾದುವು, ಗಂಡ-ಹೆಂಡತಿ, ತಂದೆ-ಮಕ್ಕಳು, ಅಣ್ಣ-ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಪಾಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. Estate duty ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಬಹುತ್ವ ಕುಟುಂಬ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು, ಒಟ್ಟು ಸಂಸಾರವನ್ನು ಒಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ದೇಶದ ಬಡತನದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಜನರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿನ ಸುಖವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಚ್ಚರದಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಎಚ್ಚರದಿಂದ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮದು ಬಂಡವಾಳಶಾಹಿ ದೇಶವಲ್ಲ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಾಹುಕಾರರು ಮತ್ತು ಕೋಟ್ಯಾಧೀಶರು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಮದರಾಸು, ಕಲ್ಕತ್ತ ಈ ಮೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ವರಮಾನ ತೆರಿಗೆಯು ಇಡೀ ಭರತಖಂಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ವರಮಾನ ತೆರಿಗೆಯ ಅರ್ಧಭಾಗಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಮನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಜಮೀನನ್ನೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ, ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆ 20-30 ಸಾವಿರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಿನ rates of inflation ಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಸಿಗಳು ವಿಪರೀತ ಏರಿ ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಕಾಲ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಧಾರಣೆಗೂ ಈಗಿನ ಧಾರಣೆಗೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕರಷ್ಟು ಅಥವ ಐದರಷ್ಟು ಬೆಲೆಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಲಿ ನಿವೇಶನಗಳು ಚದರ ಗಜ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 50 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಮಾರಾಟವಾಗಿವೆ. ಒಂದು ನಿವೇಶನದ ಬೆಲೆ 30 ಸಾವಿರ, 40 ಸಾವಿರ, 50 ಸಾವಿರ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಇವೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದು ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಐದು-ಹತ್ತು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವನ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯ ಹೊರೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಗೋತಾ ಹೊಡೆದನೆಂದರೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಂದ ಅವನ ವಾರಸುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಬಂದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಇಡೀ ಆಸ್ತಿ, ಒಡವೆ ವಸ್ತು, ಕಾಳು, ಕಡ್ಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಮನೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದೂವರೆ ಲಕ್ಷವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಿನ ಧಾರಣೆ ವಾಸಿಗಳಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಇದ್ದದ್ದು ಮನೆಗಳ ಲೆಕ್ಕಮಾತ್ರ. ಈಗ ಜಮೀನು ಸೇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಐವತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಗೆ ಮೀರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮನೆ, ಒಡವೆ, ಇತರ ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಜೊತೆ ಐವತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಆಗ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಇಲ್ಲ. ಜಮೀನನ್ನೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ತಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶ ಬಹಳ ಉದ್ಧಾರವಾಗಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ, ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ 4,800 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬನ ಆದಾಯವೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ತೆರಿಗೆಯ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಜನ ಹೊರಬಲ್ಲರು ಎಂದರೆ ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ದುರದೃಷ್ಟ. ಬೇರೆ ದೇಶಗಳು ಒಂದು ಮೈಲಿಯಷ್ಟು ದೂರ ನಡೆದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಒಂದು ಫರ್ಲಾಂಗ್ ಕೂಡ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು, ಹೇಳಲು ನಾಚಿಕೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಐವತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮೂರು ಕಾಸು ಸಹ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ವಿದ್ದರೆ ವಿಮರ್ಶಿತ ದರಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. After all it is very little. ಒಂದೂವರೆ ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಡುವವರಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಐದು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಈಗ ಮನೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಏನು ದುಡ್ಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾರಿಯಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಸಾಯಿ, ಸುಂಕ ಕೊಡು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪರದೇಶದವನು ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಅಮೇರಿಕ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗಿದೆ, ಆಸ್ಟ್ರೇಲಿಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗಿದೆ, ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಎಂದೆಲ್ಲ ಹೇಳಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವ ವಿಧಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ expert advice ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅನುಕರಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಭಾರತ ಬಡದೇಶ, ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳೇನು, ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸವಾಗಿರುವ ಜನಗಳ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳೇನೆಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇವರು ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ. ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಎಕರೆ ಅಡಕೆ ತೋಟದ ಬೆಲೆ ಹತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದೆ, ಐದು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಅಡಕೆ ತೋಟ ವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆ ಐವತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೆರೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಒಂದು ತೊಟ್ಟು ನೀರು ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೈತನಾದವನು ತನ್ನ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ ಐದಾರು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ 35 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಆದಾಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವರಮಾನ ತೆರಿಗೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೂಪರ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಷಯ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟಾಗಿವೆ, ಈಗ ಎಷ್ಟಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ—ಸಂಸಾರಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟು ಒಡೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ ಎಂಬುದು ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ, ಗಂಡ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಒಂದೇ ಕಡೆಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದೇ ಸಂಸಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದವರು ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳ ಭಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆದರಿ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಎಂಥವರಿಗೂ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಇನ್‌ಫ್ಲೇಷನ್ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಿ ತಂದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇತರ ದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೀವು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ, ಯಾರೂ ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರ ಬರೆದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ, ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ, ಅಥವ ಮಾರ್ನಾರ್ಕಿ ಯೆಂತಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ವಿನಾ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೊಂದು ಹೊಸ ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಫಿಲಾಸಫಿ, ಇನ್ನೂ ನಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಆಡಳಿತ ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಬಡವರು ಅಧೋಗತಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೂರು ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರುಗಳಿಂದ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಜನ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 40 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಇನ್ನೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ! ತೊಗರಿಬೇಳೆ ತಿನ್ನುವವರು ಹುರುಳಿ ತಿನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಹುರುಳಿ ತಿನ್ನುವವರು ಹುಣಿಸೆಬೀಜ ತಿನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ. Surplus money is only with the capitalists and not with the rural folk. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದರೆಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ತೆರಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿಜಯನಗರ ಸಾಮ್ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತು ಮಣ ಚಿನ್ನ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತಂತೆ, ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆ 36 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ; ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಆದಾಯ ಇಷ್ಟು? ಆಗ ಜನ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವೈಭವ ಸುಖಸಂತೋಷಗಳಿಂದಿದ್ದರು, ಈಗ ಅಷ್ಟೂ ಅಧೋಗತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಆದಾಯ 50 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ, per capita taxation 26 ರೂಪಾಯಿ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದಾಯ 800 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ, per capita tax 20 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ತಲೆಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಿರುವಾಗ ಬಡ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ)

ಜನರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ ಮಹಾರಾಜರೂ ಧನಿಕರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಆದರೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರನ್ನೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸಮತಾವಾದವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ?

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—for taxation you have included agricultural classes also. When compared with the Industrial classes agricultural classes pay less. Therefore, I say that this Assembly is not in favour of this taxation or the amendnent.

*Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, whatever we might say on this floor, it has no effect on the treasury benches or on the Bill. After all it is a worthless discussion because wheth r we speak in support or in opposition, it has no effect. We are in a hopeless position in these matters. This is a very ridiculous position. This could have been avoided, that is my point. It is not as if we are p werl ss under the Constitution. That is why the.e was a certain amount of objection in the beginning itself. I will personally explain that point. So far as agriculture property is concerned, estate duty is in the State List and not in the Union List. So far as estate duty in respect of agriculture land is concerned, I would like to know why it was not possible for the State Government to bring in a separate legislation. The procedure now adopted is this: That several legislatures are required to pass a resolution to the effect that the enactment of Parliament may be applied in the States as weil, and that this Act could come into force only from the finanical year *i.e.*, April 1959. Why should it happen like this? Supposing we give so much time.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is an Act of Parliament. We are adopting it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I understand that, there should be another Bill to be introduced in the Parliament. At any rate even granting the actual position whether the matter has to be again passed by the Parliament or not, the effect remains the same. Necessarily in the whole process there is delay. I would like to know whether it woul not have been possible under the Constitution to avoid the delay. Instead of allowing this resolution to be passed subsequently by the various State Legislatures, it would have been easy for the Central Government to convene a meeting of the Financ Ministers and have uniform legislati n in all the States. Nothing could have prevented them from doing it. If that procedure had been followed, I am sure possibly this revision in respect of tax itself c uld have been avoided. That is why I object to the procedure. Secondly if the other procedure had been adopted and if the State legislatures had been empowered to enact their own legislations, at least the State Legislature would have had the right to discuss that and suggest va ious amenuments, at least in minor matters.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—May I inform that the President gave assent on 19th August 1958?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If the State Legislature could pass such an Act as it was entitled to, then we would not have been deprived of suggesting amendments. That would have been a more democratic procedure. Now we are in a helpless position. The Parliament has passed the law and we are not in a position to say anything in regard to this matter. If the other procedure that I suggested had been adopted, this difficulty would not have arisen and the question of evasion could have been very well solved.

Sri T. D. MARANNA (Magadi).—How does it give room for evasion?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—So far as joint family property is concerned, it would be divided.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—All the loopholes have been plugged. Evidently, the Hon'ble Member has not followed the speeches of the communist members in the Lok Sabha.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—My remarks now will show that it is not so.

So far as the features of the main Act are concerned, I shall make one or two observations only. One point that

has been made by the Hon'ble Minister is that it is in pursuance of the socialistic pattern and that this particular measure would take us further in the direction of socialism or towards removal of inequality in property and all that. My respectful submission is that it is not so to the extent I desire. I shall presently explain why it is so. We have no doubt socialistic pattern, but there are countries which have not adopted it. For example, U. K. has not adopted this pattern.

Sri T. D. MARANNA.—Has it been adopted in Kerala ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—So far as Kerala is concerned, the position is that they will have to pass the same law as you have passed. That is the difficulty.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—What exactly do you mean by socialistic pattern ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I do not know. I can give my own interpretation of what socialism is. What we are having under discussion is a peculiar admixture of several things which goes by the name of socialistic pattern and we cannot find out what its shape is. It is so amorphous.

Sri B V DESAI.—When it has been lowered from Rs. I lakh to Rs. 50,000, is it not a step towards socialistic pattern ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I want to rebut that. First, let us take the claim of socialism, the claim of attainment of equality and all that. So far as Ceylon and Australia are concerned, I have got figures from the Lok Sabha debate. For example, we find from the Lok Sabha Debate that the committee has provided exemption limit of Rs. 50,000 whereas in the last Act it was Rs. 1 lakh. In U. K. the limit is £ 3,000 *i.e.*, about Rs. 39,000. In Ceylon, it is Rs. 20,000. In Australia, in Indian currency it is nearly Rs. 33,000. Therefore you will kindly see that the claim advanced, namely, that it is in pursuance of the so-called socialistic pattern is not justified. Even countries like U.K., Australia and others will be admitted by the other side as more capitalistic than ours.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—After all, the social security in this country is zero and you are talking of socialistic pattern. You have not even given us that social security which U. K. has given.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The Finance Minister has fallen into the trap in which I wanted him to fall. He is not prepared to follow that type of socialism which I want him to follow. If I had talked about Russia or China, he would have been justified in his argument. Countries like U. K. and Australia are not by any means, either according to his understanding or according to my understanding, socialistic ; they are definitely capitalistic. Even in those countries the exemption limit is much lower. That is the reason why I say that the claim that it is something in the direction of socialism or that it is something in the nature of reducing inequalities is all bogus.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have brought it down from Rs. 1 lakh to Rs. 50,000 and in the next few years we will bring it down to Rs. 25,000.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It is only in order to save certain sections of the people As the Hon'ble Member Sri Puttaramiya has pointed out, there is a reduction so far as higher groups are concerned. Of course, the reduction is negligible. Actually, the rate in respect of higher slabs was much higher when the Bill was introduced in the Parliament. When it went to the Select Committee, it was toned down and reduced in order to suit particular individuals or classes or interests. Our highest rate is only 40 or 43 per cent but the highest rate in U. K. is 80 per cent. Properties are of the same value, whether in U. K. or in India. If this is a piece of socialism as argued by the Finance Minister, I must say there is more socialism in U. K. than in India.

Sri T. D. MARANNA.—You are talking of capitalistic countries like U. K. After how many days of democratic rule, was this lower limit brought in there ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—What about the higher limit in respect of the

(Sri M. C. Narasimhan)

higher slab? We are behind U. K. It has nothing to do with democracy. Let us concede for a moment Sri Maranna s point that progressively, God willing, we will go lower down as in the case of Ceylon or some other country. But what about the higher groups? Why should the Government which declares that it stands for socialism feel nervous about imposing heavi r taxation on higher groups? From the Lok Sabha Debate I understand that the Act exempts the residences of former rulers like our Governor from estate duty. What is the justification for that?

4-30 p.m.

Does it mean the whole bit of it because nobody knows what "residence" is as there is no definition of "residence"? Is this a measure that can justify socialism or are we to take it, as the Finance Minister said, that it is towards socialistic pattern of society or does he mean it as a slogan and not seriously? Therefore I would like to know if it is in accord with the one other principle enunciated by the Taxation Enquiry Commission, and I submit that it is not. I read from the Taxation Enquiry Commission Report.

> "We do not therefore think that the increase in the estate duty will have any adverse effect on the volume of investment."

As submitted earlier the original Bill that was placed before the Parliament provided for higher rates. Subsequently the Select Committee toned it down and the rates were reduced. One of the justifications that was advanced for toning down the rates was that it might have adverse effect on the country. That is the remark made by the Taxation Enquiry Commission whose members are supposed to have more wisdom than very many of us. The original rate cannot be justified at all.

My next point is : a point was made here that it is in relation to the land revenue and all that. Whether one agrees with this view or not there is a relevant matter ; we have contemplated introduction of fixing ceiling in regard to agricultural property. What would happen in respect of estate duty? What would be the implicati n of estate duty *vis a vis* the ceiling is my question. It would mean, I consider, a sort of discrimination against agricultural property and not in resp ct of other urban properties. In respect of agricultural property there is ceiling but in respect of other types of property, namely, urban property, there will not be any kind of ceiling. Actually what would happen if there was a higher rate in respect of higher slabs? Urban property also would have to come within the ambit of the Act. This tax under this particular piece of legislation which urban people have to pay would be more ; thereby the effect of ceiling would be equal to their paying a higher rate of tax. So far as agricultural property is concerned, supposing we were to bring in a legislation fixing ceiling ; then so far as urban and other types of properties are concerned, they are not subject to a higher rate of taxation and it does not mean the same thing as introduction of ceiling in the case of agriculture property. That wav I feel, there is a discrimination. If Government really means seriously that there should be equal treatment in the eye of law, the thing that should have been done or action that should have been taken is either to increase the slab rate in respect of all properti s or in the alternative all other forms of property must also be brought within the ceiling. That point also was mooted some time ago by Sri Devaraj Urs and an answer was given that in respect of agricultural lands ceiling would be introduced and not in respect of other forms of property like urban property. From that point of view perhaps with regard to ceiling, etc., there is a case for higher slab and not a case for lower slab as already indicated.

I would say that, so far the original Estate Duty Act is concerned, these defects are there and they do not move in the direction of really establishing socialistic pattern of society. No facts are placed before us as to how much we are going to get. As I have already submitted, we are only in the position of

doing a post mortem in relation to these things. I do really object to this. As I submitted, when you bring in a piece of legislation we are entitled to know every information.

With these remarks I close my speech.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, I stand to support the resolution. While supporting I would like to offer a few comments. It was argued differently by different members who have participated in the discussion. I was not able to understand the philosophy which each of them had been following or the group or the party to which he belongs. It was objected to on many grounds. There will be objection if there is reduction in tax on some ground and there will be objection again if there is enhancement of tax. This is a measure which is sought to take us a step further in our ideal of socialistic pattern of society. Some comment was made as to the socialistic pattern of society. I need hardly remind this House that we have made our goal very clear. We have put our cards before the country and before the electorate that it is our endeavour to reach the goal by stages. Some States or some nations did achieve these objectives in a drastic way by overnight orders. We are a State who are determined to pursue the path of democracy and to develop it. If it were left to the party bosses as elsewhere to decide for the nation it would have been much earlier. But things will have to be done with consent. Consent always means persuation. It means time. Therefore if some time is taken in enacting progressive legislation comments should not be levelled against the party in power to say that "you are not serious about what you do".

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I have no objection to doing things by persuasion. The point is not to make tall claims about socialism.

Sri K. S SURYANARAYANA RAO.—It has been the philosophy of some persons to rush things and in doing so they have a purpose. I do not wish to dilate much on that point except to remind the House that the intentions of the party in sponsoring such motions are more important than anything else. If we recall the proceedings of the Central Parliament of the days of 1945-47, we will find where bad motives or wrong intentions lead us to.

Sir, if a disruptive tendency is there in a man, he can say rosy things and still upset the economy of the country in no time. That we are not prepared to do. It was mentioned that the level of taxation so far as this particular measure is concerned is lower than in a capitalistic State. My friend has already stated that it takes time. Hardly ten years have passed after independence and it is not our intention to upset the economy of the country by over-night changes of drastic nature. It needs some persuasion and we must allow the people to adjust themselves. If you take the measures that have been passed and the steps taken for the past ten years, everyone will admit that we are progressing at a faster speed than what my Hon ble friend dubbed us to be. In the United Kingdom, it is stated that the higher slab is up to 80 per cent and that it is only 40 per cent here. Here, for anything that the State Government does they take expert opinion and after it is given, and if it is accepted, then it takes time to implement those recommendations because the public reaction is also to be taken into consideration. As already said by the Hon ble Finance Minister, it is the next step. The third step may come some time later in reducing the higher slab from 50 to 40, 30 or 20 thousands as in other countries.

We were criticised for not providing social security and for bringing this measure. I leave the matter there for the Hon'ble members to judge.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Can you tell us what is meant by socialistic security that has come to stay either in the United Kingdom or France or in Australia ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The next point that I would like to mention is about the criticism that the State Legislature should have legislated this measure. From my understanding I feel that it would be the easiest way to

(SRI K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO)

leave the matter in the hands of the Centre, because we will not be financially committing ourselves by this measure. The Centre collects the amount and pays the State its quota. Supposing each State has its own measu e. Then it will have to povide for its own machinery to execute and to administer this law. It was mentioned that if the State Legislature had this power and exercised it, this House could have adopted it. Well, Sir, our own representatives are at the Centre and they have taken part in the debates, on resolutions and the Bills. These measures are published and we will have ample time to educate our legislators at Delhi in this matter.

It was also said that a uniform pattern of this legislation could have been discussed and each legislature allowed to introduce a Bill of this kind. As I said the Finance Minister will have to clarify the position. In case the State passes a legislation, it may not be possible to delegate that power of administration to the Centre. Whereas under the Constitution, the State Government could delegate the legislative power of the State to the Centre and have it administered through central authority.

Sir, the benefits that could accrue has already been mentioned. From the reports that are available we could see that another ten thousand persons come under the revised Act. If that is so, it is really a position advantageous to the common man because whatever legislation is passed and whatever measure is taken in matters of finances, it is intended to improve the conditions of the common man. In so doing the richer section of the community will have to share. If the richer section has to share, I think that it is only the person who could afford to pay that is taxed and not the common man. It was said that there was some discrimination, because this resolution seeks to tax agricultural property. It is therefore said that it was discriminatory in character since other spheres of activity were not covered. So far as the other properties are concerned, it is already covered under the Estates Duty. Moreover, the incidence of income-tax is very high and there is clamour from industry to that end. There is clamour from that section of the community that the State is taxing them more. So, Sir, if on all sides the richer section of the community are taxed and are made to pay for the benefits of the less, fortunat s, believe this House should not object. With that object in view, this piece of legislation is envisaged by the Centre and we will be well within our rights to approve of this, because our goal is socialism, the pattern that was commented upon. 'Socialistic pattern' we say, because we do not mean to do things by immediate drastic measures but by stages. Therefore it is a pattern and a method of our own suitable to the local conditions and our past and our pres nt economic position, that in order to achieve a radical end with the Consent of the people that concern we have got to go by stages and if that process of socialism is misconstrued or if the socialistic pattern is dubbed as capitalism, I am afraid I have not been able to follow.

Sir, it is said that the first slab is at four per cent and gradually it goes up to forty per cent. It is the person who pays that knows the pains of it. Even forty per cent on an agricultural property is not a small tax. Therefore, it cannot be very lightly said that forty per cent is a very small sum. Of course to a person who earns lakhs and lakhs, to pay Rs. 3,500 or 4,000 may not be much. But the percentage does work to a very high amount.

Sir, it is said that the measure was a bit delayed. It has its own reasons. It was said that the Bill originally put before the Parliament was more drastic and it was toned down to a lower degree in the Select Committee. Well Sir, we have to bow down to the wishes of the majority. In so doing, if it is reduced, we must not find fault with it.

With these words, I commend this resolution.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೆನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಕೆಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಸೇರಿ ಬಹುಶಃ ಅವರ

ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾದುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಿಯೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರತಿನಿತ್ಯದ ಕನಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತೇವೆ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಬರುವರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ಕೆಲವರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು socialistic pattern ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ definition ಅಥವಾ ವಿವರವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಿದರು. ಬಹುಶಃ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರನ್ನು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ನಿಜವಾದ ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರಂತೆಯೇ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಮೆಯನ್ನುಮಾಡಿ ಇಟ್ಟರೆ ಹೇಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಗಡಿಯಾರವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಅದು ನಿಮಿಷನಿಮಿಷಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಅದೇರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅಂಕಿಗಳನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಅದೇ ಮಾದರಿಯ ಒಂದು ಗಡಿಯಾರವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಅದು ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದೇರೀತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಧ್ಯೇಯವೂ ನೆರವೇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರೆ. ಆದರೆ socialistie pattern ಎಂಬುದರ ಗೂಢಾರ್ಥ ಏನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತಾನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಪರಿಣಾಮಕಾರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಆಗುಹೋಗುಗಳು ಯಾವರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುತ್ತವೆಂಬ ಅಂಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತರಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮಗೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದುಸಲ ವೋಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡೋಣ ಎಂದು ಜನರು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದುಸಲ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಏಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು adopt ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಎಂದು . . . . . .

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—What time would the Hon'ble Minister take for reply?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I beg to submit that the observations are really not germane to the subject. I will take only ten minutes.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಗಿದ್ದರೂ fragmentation policy ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, land reforms ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ನೀವು ಏಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ, ನಿಮಗೆ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಇದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಾದ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿದೆ. You have to adopt or reject it. ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—252ನೆ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ adopt ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಮುಖೇನ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಅನುಕೂಲವೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅರ್ಥಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಮಗೆಷ್ಟು ವರಮಾನ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಂಶ ನಮಗೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂಭತ್ತು-ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರನ್ನು exempt ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. Annexureನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರನ್ನೂ ಇದರ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾನಾ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಆ ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷದಿಂದ 50ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷದಿಂದ 50ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ರಾಜಾಧಿರಾಜರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದು ಅನ್ವಯಿಸದಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ಕಾರಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಸರ್ ಸಿ. ವಿ. ರಾಮನ್ ಅವರು ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನಿಗಳಲ್ಲೊಬ್ಬರು. ಅವರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ, ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ? ಹೀಗೆ analyse ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಹೋದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತವೆ.

ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೂಲಕ adopt ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯ ಬೇರೆ. Just to satisfy the formality of Art. 252 of the constitution ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇರೆಯಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ socialistic pattern ಎಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ capitalistic countries ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಆ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರ ಮಟ್ಟ ಹೇಗಿದೆ, per capita income ಏನಿದೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನಿದೆ, ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಆ ದೇಶಗಳಿಗೂ, ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಹೋಲಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ joint family ಯಲ್ಲಿನ jointnessಗೆ, ಹಿಂದೂ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬ ವಾದವಿದೆ. ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಫ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಟು-ಹತ್ತು ಜನರಿದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಸ್ತಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಆ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಹತ್ತನೆಯ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗವೆಂದರೆ ಹತ್ತುಸಾವಿರರೂಪಾಯಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾಲ್ಕುಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಅವರು ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯಾದರೂ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ relief ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಿತ್ತು.

ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತತ್ವಶಃ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಆಶಾದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ Constitutionಗೆ ನಾವು ತಲೆಬಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ನಾವು ಶಿಸ್ತಿನ ಸಿಪಾಯಿಗಳಂತೆ ಬಾಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ವಿನಾ

(ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ)

ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಾಯಕ್ಕಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Sir, just one clarification. Before the Parliament contemplated bringing about this amendment, was there any reference to the State Government with regard to their views about the amendments that were sought to be introduced in the Parliament? Because some time or other, these enactments will be made applicable to the various States. Before the Parliament contemplated introducing this particular legislation in the Parliament, was there any reference made to the State Government as to their recommendation with regard to this measure?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—So far as the information at my disposal is concerned, I do not think any reference was made to the State at the preliminary juncture. Subsequently, they have written to us and they have asked us to ascertain the opinion of the Legislature.

5 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ (ತುಮಕೂರು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಥಸಚಿವರು ಇಂಡಿಯಾದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂಥದಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಶಿರಸಾವಹಿಸಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಆದರೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತಲೆಬಾಗಿ ಸಿಪಾಯಿಯಂತೆ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದುತ್ತದೆಯೆ ಅಥವ ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಇದು ಬರಿಯ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾತ್ರ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ನಾನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ದೂಷಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಆದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುವವರನ್ನು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹತ್ತುವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ನೂರಾರು ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ರೈತರ ಮತ್ತು ವರ್ತಕರ ಬೆನ್ನುಮೂಳೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮುರಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೂರುಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಇದ್ದುದು ಈಗ 65 ಲಕ್ಷರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ರೈತರಿಗೂ ವರ್ತಕರಿಗೂ ಏನಾದರೂ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆಯೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿ. ಬರಿಯ ನಾಲಗೆಯ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು, ಆತ್ಮಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ, ಹೃದಯವನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಲಿ. ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋರವಾಲಾರವರು ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹೇಳಿದಕೂಡಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅದೇ ವರಪ್ರಸಾದವೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಸೇಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್, ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಮ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನ ನೆಪದಿಂದ ಪುಡಾರಿಗಳು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತರ ಮತ್ತು ವರ್ತಕರ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಳುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಅವರು ನಡೆಯದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೆದರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಎಂದರೇನು? ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಗಂಡು ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಬೊಂಬೆಗಳನ್ನುಮಾಡಿ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅವುಗಳು ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್. ಅಡ್ವರ್ಟೈಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಥವ ಪ್ರಚಾರಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂದೊಂದು ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೆ? ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬರಿಯ ಒಂದು ಅಡ್ವರ್ಟೈಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬೇಡ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದು ಅನುಕೂಲವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಶಿರಸಾವಹಿಸಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನೂರಾರು ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಇದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ರೈತ ಕೋರ್ಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಸಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಐದುವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕೇವಲ 67 ಕೇಸ್‌ಗಳಾಗಿವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಅದೇನೇ ಇರಲಿ; ಗೋರವಾಲಾರವರು ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, 'whose fathers diwali is it'? ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಕಠಿಣವಾದ ಮಾತೇನೋ ಹೌದು ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಈಗ 50 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುವವರು ಯಾರು? ಬೆಲೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುವವರು ಯಾರು? ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖುಷ್ಕಿ ಜಮೀನು ಎಕರೆಗೆ 500ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ಸಾವಿರ ಹಾಕಬಹುದು. ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುವವರು ಯಾರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ತಹಶೀಲ್‌ದಾರರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಅವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಎಸ್. ಇ. ಎಸ್. ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ನೀವೂ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಮೂವತ್ತು ಜನರಿರುವ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಮೂರು ಜನರಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ?

ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಬೆಲೆ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಮೊದಲು ಒಂದೇ ಅಪೀಲಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತು, ಈಗ ಎರಡು ಅಪೀಲ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ರೈತರು ಕೋರ್ಟು, ಕಚೇರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಲಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ತೆತ್ತು ಕೆಟ್ಟು ಹಾಳಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕಾನೂನಿದೆ. ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ಯಾರಿಗೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಾಡಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಜಮೀನ್‌ದಾರರಿಗೂ ರೈತರಿಗೂ ಏನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಈಗ

ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ಮನೆಯ ಹೆಂಗಸು ತಲೆ ಬಾಚಿಕೊಂಡು, ಹೂವು ಮುಡಿದು ಕೊಂಡು ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಸಿನಿಮಾಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಗಂಡಸು ಇನ್ನೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೆ, ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕು.

(Some Members on the other side rose to interrupt).

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—I am going to say once again, I am not afraid, you are ruining the country. When I am talking, do not interrupt me. Be sincere in your administration. With due respect to the Chair, I say to Government, do not accept blindly. We are not here to accept anything. We are not in the Russian field, we have no fear of what happened to Malenkov, you should behave yourself as Government and a real Government for the good of the people. In the interest of improving the lot of the common man they should work and not in the interest of only some men.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರು ರೈತರನ್ನು ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಜನರನ್ನು ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಜಾ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತೈದು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿನ ಕಾರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಓಡಾಡಿ ಮಜಾ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ತಹಶೀಲ್‌ದಾರರು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಅಕ್ವಿಜಿಷನ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ 17ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಮೀನು ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನರ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಳು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದವರು, ಅವರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ, ಸೇಲ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್, ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್‌ಚರಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಮ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಇವುಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಏನೇನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಅವರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎನ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ರೈತರಿಗೇನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಅವರನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಹೇಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರು ಬಿಡುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಿಧಾನಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೂ, ದೆಹಲಿ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಮಂದಿ ಎಡಗೈ ಹೆಬ್ಬೆಟ್ಟಿನ ಗುರುತು ಹಾಕುವವರು. ಅವರಿಗೇನು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಕೊಂಚ ಸಸ್ಪೆನ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ, ಆಸ್ತಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚಿಸಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

*Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am indeed surprised that this resolution should have evoked such a debate and more so from my Hon'ble friend Sri Narasimhan. Knowing as I do his mode of attack, he did not surprise me, but nevertheless the arguments advanced, I respectfully submit, are irrelevant. What is contemplated is that either we have to accept the Amendment Act or not accept it. That is the only alternative before us. This State has already committed itself because it has surrendered its power of legislation to the Parliament under article 252 of the Constitution. As the Hon'ble Members are aware, it is safer and better if the Parliament were to legislate in the case of estate duty since it is an all-India problem. From that point of view certain States conceded this power to begin with and certain other States have adopted the Acts passed by the Parliament. Therefore, there is nothing wrong in what we are doing. I made clear to the House the several provisions of the Amendment Bill. The only point that was objected to was that the rate ought not to have been lowered. I shall show how it affects the several slabs. Upto Rs. 50,000 there is no tax either at present or according to the revised rates. The one lakh slab is a very vital slab. At present there is no tax on this slab and according to the revised rates we will be getting Rs. 2,000 only. It is not a very large sum and his entire property is not taken away. In this connection, I must say that if there is gross under-valuation, or exaggerated valuation, there are some remedies provided. Let the Hon'ble Member Sri Puttanna refer to the details of the Bill. The party is also given the option of two appeals whereas under the original Act there is only one appeal to the Board of Revenue. Take for instance the 1,50,000 slab. According to the rates, the tax would be Rs. 3,750 whereas according to the revised rates it would be Rs. 65,000. Take the 50 lakhs slab. According to the existing rates, the tax would come to Rs. 14,01,250. According to revised rates, it would come to Rs. 14,02,000. It is not a very wide variation. Accord-

(SRI T. MARIAPPA)

ing to the Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan, we have been halting in adopting higher rates on higher slabs. He even quoted the instance of Australia and U.K. We are always for evolution and not for a bloody revolution which perhaps endears itself to my Hon'ble friend. After all, in a process of evolution we have to take the consent of so many people. We have to flatten the angularities, persuade certain people and convince certain people. Therefore, naturally it is a slow process and we do not want to ride roughshod over the rights of the people. Therefore, they have very cautiously devised the existing rates. They are not going to hit hard anybody. On the other hand, they are going to bring a little more income. Therefore, it is a gradual process which they have adopted. Perhaps in the next five years there will be higher rates on higher slabs. Even according to him, instead of 40 per cent he wants the revised rate to be 60 per cent. It is always safer to go slow in a manner which would not unnecessarily cause any pin-pricks to the heirs of the people who will have to pay this tax before they inherit property.

Another point is, are you going to lose anything by adopting this resolution or are you adopting the Act for the first time ? That is not so. With open eyes this Legislature has adopted the Estate Duty Act in the larger interest. The first three amending Bills are very minor. It is only the last amending Bill of 1958 which is vital where the exemption limit has been lowered and certain gifts have been exempted. Therefore, you will please see how cautious the Parliament has been. The original Bill had provided for higher rates, but the Select Committee reduced the rates in such a manner that it should be acceptable to all sections of the House. I am pretty certain that the party to which he belongs never opposed it in the manner in which he did it here.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am hundred per cent certain that what the Finance Minister is saying is not a fact.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Somehow it seems to me that Sri Narasimhan has become a revisionist. Whatever that be, I am not prepared to dilate on Socialism or Socialistic Pattern of Society or Communism. Let us adopt the methods which will suit our circumstances, particularly the illiterate agriculturists. That is the very reason why we want to go slow and in a steady manner. I very respectfully submit to the House that this resolution ought not to have taken more than half-an-hour. I do not know why three and a half hours were allotted for it. Perhaps, the representative of the socialist party insisted that it must be allotted so that it could be thoroughly discussed. With these few words, I commend the acceptance of the Resolation by of the House.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, is it open to anybody to reveal the proceedings of the Business Advisory Committee or of the Select Committee in the manner in which the Finance Minister has done now ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—He himself referred to the proceedings of the Select Committee.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, is it fair to suggest that they yielded to the request of the Opposition though it is definitely laid down that it was a unanimous report of the Business Advisory Committee ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Usually, the time is fixed in consultation with all the interests concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It is not a serious objection. The question is:

"Whereas by resolutions passed in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution, the levy of estate duty in respect of agricultural land in the State of Mysore is governed by the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) passed by Parliament;

And whereas the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) has been amended by Act 17 of 1954, Act 41 of 1954, Act 36 of 1957 and Act 33 of 1958 passed by Parliament;

And whereas it appears to this Assembly to be desirable that the matters specified in the amending Acts aforesaid in so far as they relate to estate duty in respect of agricultural land should be regulated in the State by Parliament by law;

Now therefore this Assembly hereby resolves in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution that the matters aforesaid in so far as they are matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the State may be regulated in the State by Parliament by law and for this purpose the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) may be amended accordingly."

The motion was adopted.

The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 8-30 A.M.

The House adjourned at Twenty-five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock on Saturday, the 22nd November 1958.

WD 2200—GPB—900—2-3-59